

USSN 10/771,760

6

REMARKS

The March 9, 2005, Office action rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 102(b), objected to claim 1 on a formality, objected to claims 3-7 on the basis of their dependence from rejected base claims 1 and 2, and allowed claims 8-12. In addition the Examiner indicated that claims 3-7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 13 and 14 have been withdrawn.

To expedite prosecution of this case, this Amendment and Response amends claims 1 and 2, without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the original claims in co-pending applications. Support for the various amendments may be found in the originally filed specification, claims and figures; no new matter has been introduced. In view of the amendments and remarks presented in this paper, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

In the March 9, 2005, Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent no. 2,901,528 (Lazar). For the following reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite that the *coaxial cable has an exposed inner dielectric section extending between said exposed core section and said exposed shield section*. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment finds full support in the originally filed claims, specification, or drawings as filed.

The structure as recited in claim 1 is distinct over the cited references for a least the reason that neither Lazar nor any of the other cited references discloses, teaches or suggests coaxial cable termination system, as described in claim 1, wherein the core of a coaxial cable has an exposed core section, the shield of the same coaxial cable has an exposed shield section, and the same coaxial cable also includes an exposed inner dielectric section extending between the exposed core section and the exposed shield section. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the §102(b) rejection of independent claim 1 is not proper and claim 1, as amended, is allowable.

USSN 10/771,760

7

Applicants have also amended claim 2, which depends from claim 1, to recite that *the core body and the shield body are mutually separated a short distance therebetween at the exposed inner dielectric*. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment finds full support in the originally filed claims, specification, or drawings as filed.

In addition to the reasons set forth regarding claim 1, the structure as recited in claim 2, which depends from claim 1, is distinct over the cited references for at least the additional reason that neither Lazar nor any of the other cited references discloses, teaches or suggests coaxial cable termination system, as described in claim 2, *wherein the core body is cast over the exposed core section, the shield body is cast over the exposed shield section, and the core and shield bodies are mutually separated a short distance therebetween at the exposed inner dielectric*. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the §102(b) rejection of dependent claim 2 is not proper and claim 2, as amended, is allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections of claims 1 and 2 is requested.

Claim Objections

In the March 9, 2005, Office action, the Examiner objected to claim 1 on the basis of an informality and required the insertion of -other- following "each" in the last line of the claim. To expedite prosecution of this case, Applicant has rewritten claim 1 accordingly. s 1-14 in accordance with the format specified by 37 CFR 1.75(i) and has excluded the use of the restriction "of the type." Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection to claim 1 are requested.

In the March 9, 2005, Office action, the Examiner also objected to claims 3-7 on the basis of their dependence on rejected based claims 1 and 2. As discussed above, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2 and respectfully submits that they are now allowable. Therefore, claims 3-7, which depend from claims 1 and 2 are also allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection to claims 3-7 are requested.

USSN 10/771,760

8

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 2 and the objections to claim 1 and claims 3-7. Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail or deem that further amendments should be made to improve the form of the claims, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience.

Please charge any necessary fees, including any extension of time, or any other fee deficiencies to Delphi Technologies, Inc., Deposit Account No. 50-0831.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David P. Wood
Registration No: 45,932
Attorney for Applicant
Phone No. 248-813-1202
Fax No. 248-813-1222